Remarks

Claims 1 and 3-16 are pending. Claims 1 and 3-16 are rejected. Claims 3 and 4 are cancelled and the rejections with regard to these claims are now moot. Claims 1, 5, 7 and 10 are currently amended. Support for the amendments can be found at, for example, the first two full paragraphs on page 3 and the paragraph spanning pages 4 and 5 of the originally filed application.

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the helpful interview of May 18, 2009 in which the rejections were discussed. The substance of that interview is reflected in this Response which is in accordance with the Examiner's helpful guidance.

Claims 1, 5-11 and 13-16 are rejected as obvious under 35 USC §103(a) over the combination of US '116 and US '400.

Claims 3 and 4 are not obvious over 35 USC §103(a) over the combination of US '116 and US '400.

Amended Claims 1, 5-11 and 13-16 are not obvious under 35 USC § 103(a) over the combination of US '116 and US '400. Reasons are set forth below.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite the step of "processing by an iterative learning process in a neural network said time-communications parameters stored in the memory by correlating at least one of the time-related communication parameters with the real address[.]" Independent Claim 7 now recites "means for modeling processing by an iterative learning process in a neural network of time-related communications parameters stored in the memory to model the optimal sequences[.]" Independent Claim 10 has been amended to recite the step of "processing by an iterative learning process in a neural network the time-related parameters to determine an optimal order to sequentially search the real addresses for particular time of day or day of week[.]" Dependent Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 13-16 similarly incorporate this recitation of amended independent Claim 1.

Together, this means that the core combination of US '116 and US '400 fails to teach all of the elements of amended Claims 1, 5-11 and 13-16. This is because none of these references teach "an iterative learning process in a neural network[.]" Consequently, the combination of US '116 and US '400 fails to teach all the elements of the claimed method and device. Consequently, the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness.

5

The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of amended Claims 1, 5-11 and 13-16 under 35 USC §103(a) over the combination of US '116 and US '400.

Claim 12 is rejected as obvious under 35 USC §103(a) over the combination of US '116, US '400 and US '791.

Amended Claim 12 is not obvious under 35 USC §103(a) over the combination of US '116, US '400 and US '791. The rejection relies on the core combination of US '116 and US '400 as discussed above. The citation of US '791 in the rejection does nothing to cure the deficiencies of the core combination of US '116 and US '400 discussed above. Consequently, the combination of US '116, US '400 and US '791 also fails to teach all the elements of the claimed methods and device. This means that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness.

The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 12 as obvious under 35 USC §103(a) over the combination of US '116, US '400 and US '791.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that all the claims are currently in condition of allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for the Applicant

TDC/vbm
(215) 656-3381

6